The Establishment of Petrine-Pushkinian Russia: A Philosophical Perspective

Vladimir K. Kantor

VLADIMIR K. KANTOR

The Establishment of Petrine-Pushkinian Russia: A Philosophical Perspective

The Petrine-Pushkinian era lasted no more than two hundred years. It originated at the Battle of Poltava, where Russian troops first showed themselves not just equal to the Swedes, who were otherwise the best European troops at the time, but even surpassed them. Russia became a part of Europe. As both poets and historians (Fyodor Tyutchev, Vasilii Kliuchevskii) have said, Peter the Great's empire rose in response to Charles the Great's, just as Russian state power rose in response to its Roman-German counterparts. Peter declared Russia an empire in 1721, giving it both a supra-confessional and supranational idea, creating a legal framework, the first step toward freedom of man. Pushkin sang the work of Peter, imbuing the new capital, Petersburg, with a soul. This allowed Georgy Fedotov to call Pushkin a singer of both empire and freedom. The October Revolution of the 1917 and Civil War, that broke out in late 1917, served as the tragic end to the era.

Vladimir Karlovich Kantor, a doctor of philosophical sciences and professor, is Head of the International Laboratory for the Study of Russian and European Intellectual Dialogue at the National Research University Higher School of Economics, Russia. Email: vlkantor@mail.ru.

Translated by Brad Damaré.

I would like to begin this discussion with a quote by Nikolai Berdyaev:

> Many naïve and incoherent people think that we can reject Peter and preserve Pushkin, that we can force a break between the singular and whole fate of a people and their culture. But Pushkin's link with Peter was unbreakable, and he was conscious of that organic link.[1]

I shall take this observation further by reminding the reader that the Petrine-Pushkinian period lasted for no more than two hundred years of Russian history. In 1925, Ivan Bunin wrote a brilliant poem, "Peter's Memorial Day," in which he designated this era as that of Russia's greatness, calling it the Petrine-Pushkinian era. He referred to St. Petersburg as "the great and sacred city built by Peter and Pushkin," the symbol of that Russia. Peter built the city, and Pushkin breathed its soul into it.

Noting that the student had surpassed his teacher, Pushkin's own teacher, Vasily Zhukovskii, expressed this fairly philosophical thought in 1826:

> There is nothing more elevated than to be a writer in the real sense. Especially for Russia. For us, a writer with genius would do more than Peter the Great. This is why I would like to transform for a moment into a spirit of inspiration for Pushkin, to say to him, 'Your age belongs to you! You can do more than all of your ancestors!'[2]

—in other words: to continue civilization in Russia, to give, like the Lord, names to the surrounding world and thus to cultivate it, since a name is the first step to self-cognition and self-consciousness.

According to some very intelligent Russians, Pushkin is *not Russian enough* for Europeans who seek a *native rootedness and exoticism*. As the poet himself said: "For them, nothing I write/smells enough of Rus."[3] The reaction of Westerners is understandable. I would like to refer to an observation by Fyodor Stepun, a prominent Russian thinker who lived in Germany for the better part of his life:

> Conversing with foreigners, particularly with Germans who knew
> Russian and read Pushkin, I often encountered the opinion that he is,
> of course, a superlative poet, but there is little in him of the typical
> Russian. We can explain this deeply wrong and, to a Russian, incom-
> prehensible judgment by the fact that Germans consider the Russia of
> Tolstoy and Dostoevsky to be the genuine Russia.[4]

Why is this the case? It seems to be understandable. Foreigners expect
mysteries and riddles of Russia; everyone is captivated by Tyutchev's lines
about how "Russia cannot be understood with the mind," that "there is no
creator in creation, nor reason for our prayers." This is how savages, how
non-Europeans, reason. How many of country's own original thinkers
played along with this concept of Russia, from Tyutchev all the way to
Belov and Rasputin! Against the current of these ideas there is Pushkin's
passionate, very personal, almost Cartesian statement: "I want to live, so
as to think and suffer." No tender feelings here: he is the equal of
Shakespeare, of Dante, of Goethe; he feels and thinks as they do.

How did this "non-Russian poet" become the center and source of the
great Russian literature? Émigrés were already discussing how "there was
now a desire to bring Pushkin closer to Orthodoxy, to unite them. This
operation has been almost painless, because any sort of exercise such as
this will succeed with the ever-evasive Pushkin."[5] To do this, however,
they had to distance themselves from Pushkin, *to transform the poet into
an idol*, which meant renouncing the essence of his achievements, for this
led to idolatry, which the Bible rejected. This naturally led to a rejection of
the real Pushkin, who continued Russia's spiritual growth, which had been
initiated by Peter the Great's achievements. Perhaps only Dmitry
Merezhkovsky noticed this before the Russian October Revolution:

> In fact, Pushkin is still the only response worthy of Peter's great
> question about the Russian people's participation in global culture.
> Pushkin responded to Peter just as the word responds to action.
> Returning to primitive Christian and folk elements, especially in
> their extreme and one-sided manifestations, in Leo Tolstoy's con-
> tempt for science and Dostoevsky's contempt for the "rotten West,"
> all subsequent Russian literature represents a sort of betrayal against
> the incipience of global culture that had been bequeathed by two
> singular and misunderstood Russian heroes, Peter and Pushkin.[6]

Pushkin called Peter "*a revolutionary mind*." It is worth considering whether
the act we habitually call revolution is what the poet had in mind. For him,
a revolutionary is a creator. One can love one's homeland without thought,
without a mind: stupidly, patriotically, officially. An intelligent man who sees all

the mud and the crudeness can reject and hate Russia, but an intelligent man can love Russia only if he is a creator, because he wants to help create rather than destroy this country. In that context, the Petrine reforms can be considered a revolution, while the counter-reforms of Nicholas I are a counter-revolution, the Great Reforms of Alexander II a revolution, the October Revolution that overturned and washed away the results of Russia's reforms a counter-revolution, and so forth.

It was not only political figures such as Struve but also politically neutral Russian historians and philologists who have sensed the essential, fundamental link between Pushkin's creative work and Peter's construction of Russia. In this context, let me cite Petr M. Bitsilli:

> The only people who cannot appreciate Pushkin's enormous contribution towards creating Russian national statehood are those for whom the world of spiritual values created by the geniuses of religion, art, and philosophy is less "real" than the world of physical, tangible things. In the spirit of Lomonosov and Derzhavin, but to an infinitely greater degree, Pushkin continues the work of Peter [the Great] and Catherine [the Great].[7]

One could not beg for entry to Europe; Europe had to be entered boldly and decisively, which Peter in fact did. As Pushkin wrote: "Russia entered Europe like a newly launched ship, to the thump of an ax and thunder of cannons. But the wars undertaken by Peter the Great were beneficial and fruitful. The Battle of Poltava resulted in a successful national transformation, as the European Enlightenment came to berth at the shores of a conquered Neva."[8]

Peter attempted to create a Russian stronghold from nothing, from the "Kaluga dough" (as Konstantin Kavelin described the Russian people). Many unexpected, unintended symbols figure in Peter's deeds. Growing up in the village of Preobrazhenskii ("Transfiguration") and having established the Preobrazhenskii regiment as his personal guard, he did in fact *transfigure* Russia. Pushkin wrote proudly of his African great-grandfather that Peter had appointed lieutenant captain of the bombardier company of the Preobrazhenskii regiment, of whom the tsar himself served as captain. Anna Akhmatova called Peter a *Preobrazhenets*.[9] The noble guard, dressed in the Preobrazhenskii uniforms,[10] entrusted Catherine the Great, who continued Peter's cause, with the throne. If one sought out the main visible symbol of Petrine reorganization, however, it would be the *stone city* erected by the emperor, a stone city confronting a largely *wooden* Russia (recall that the Latin-Roman origin of the name "Peter" is translated as "stone"). Nor is it by chance that Osip Mandelstam's *Petersburg*

stanzas were compiled in a book called *Stone*. The man continuing the Petrine-Pushkinian cause was destroyed by Bolshevik Moscow.

The Russian Empire created by Peter the Great was open to all peoples ("all flags will be our guests," wrote Pushkin), but it was, above all, open to Europe, with whom Russia once again felt an inner unity, as during the days of Novgorod and Kievan Rus.' The capital city of St. Petersburg, founded and built by Peter, created spiritual tension in Russia. Where Ivan III had invited architects from Italy, Peter's policy was different. He sent his Russian subjects to study in Europe. It was not by chance that the first builder of St. Petersburg was P.M. Eropkin, who studied "architectural matters" in Rome by Peter's order.[11] Petersburg in turn became the city that structured the new Russia, that transformed it into an empire.

Peter built a new capital based on the idea of Rome. We should recall the very true and profound observation of Russian scholars that the new aspects of St. Petersburg's construction and the transfer of the capital there are immediately evident in the semiotic interrelationship with the idea of Moscow as "the Third Rome." Of the two possible paths—the capital as the focal point of holiness and the capital as the shadow of imperial Rome— Peter chose the second. Rome had created a great empire in its open embrace of tribes and peoples. "The dream of global unity and global dominion," Berdyaev wrote of the idea of empire in the early twentieth century, "is the everlasting dream of mankind. The Roman Empire was the greatest attempt at such a unity and such a dominion. And any universalism, even to this day, is associated with Rome, as a spiritual rather than geographical concept."[12]

The departure from tsarist Muscovy, along with Peter's statement on receiving the title of emperor that Russia would not be the next Byzantium, which fell because of its own weakness and insignificance, testifies to a certain conscious, historiosophical choice on the part of the Transformer (*Preobrazovatel'*) toward a new orientation in historical and geographical space:

> We should thank God with all our strength, but, though hoping for peace, we should not weaken our military affairs, so as to avoid the fate of the Greek monarchy; *we must strive for the common good*, which God makes evident to us both here and abroad, *from which the people will obtain relief* (italics mine).[13]

All the conceptual and political attitudes of Peter retained their vitality until the nationalist about-face of Nicholas II.

It is worth noting that, in accepting the title of emperor, Peter not only indicated his orientation toward Europe but also demonstrated his departure from both Byzantine and Tatar heritage. An empire is a supranational paradigm, where Europeanism plays the role of an overarching idea guiding all of

a state's peoples. After conquering ancient Greece, Rome became the heir to ancient Greek religion and culture, using it to overcome national insularity and to take the first step toward global greatness. Eighteenth-century Europe, however, perceived itself as a direct reproduction or restoration of ancient Greece: "Europe is at present a copy at large, of what Greece was formerly, a pattern in miniature."[14] The new Rome, Russia, could thus boldly follow the example of the first Rome in borrowing culture, technology, and science from Europe, doing so by elevating rather than humiliating itself, absorbing Europe into itself as Rome once absorbed Hellas.

Peter the Great's funeral in St. Petersburg was a religious and histori-cally significant event. Examining how Peter's contemporaries perceived him as a new Constantine the Great, one modern scholar has recalled Peter's orientation to the first Rome, the city of *St. Peter, who is buried in that Eternal City*. There is also, however, the fact that Moscow acquired its status as the seat of Orthodoxy under Ivan Kalita, and *the Russian Metropolitan Peter was later buried there*. This author writes:

> The new capital of the Russian empire was inscribed into the Christian context, and tradition was observed … The three Peters have three sacred graves: the Apostle Peter, the defender of Christian Rome and of the whole "Earthly City" in St. Peter's Basilica; St. Peter, Metropolitan of All Russia in Moscow's Cathedral of the Assumption, … which is related to the Second and Third Romes. Finally, the tomb of Peter the Great in Peter and Paul Cathedral and the tomb of the Christian Emperor Constantine … in the Church of the Holy Apostles create a reliable support for the faithful of Rus' to unite the secular, imperial history, the universal Christian history, and the national history.[15]

After the catastrophe that was the Russian October Revolution, the affinity between St. Petersburg and the great Rome became unquestionable for Russian émigrés; this idea echoed passionately, sadly, and even exces-sively, but it did echo. In 1926, Georgy Fedotov wrote:

> The fading gold of Venice and even of the Eternal Rome pales before the grandeur of the dying Petersburg. Rome is Petersburg! Rome encircled the Mediterranean with a ring of Greek columns, gods, and ideas. Rome imposed the gentle chains of Latin laws on its Southern peoples. Petersburg embodied Palladio's dreams at the Arctic Circle, paved the swamps with granite, and scattered Greek porticos for thousands of versts among northern birch and fir. It brought a glimpse of the Greek genius, tempered in the forge of the Russian spirit, to the Samoyeds and the Chukchi.[16]

It was Petersburg that became the stumbling stone (pardon the pun) in arguments and disputes about Russia's possible fate. It is interesting how this city, which became a symbol of European Russia after the October catastrophe, was then perceived as a symbol of Asian despotism. Even before the Slavophiles had witnessed the apparent introduction of Europeanism into Russia through the city, even before Herzen, Bakunin, and Bolsheviks who hated the *city*, two great poets confronted Petersburg's fate: Adam Mickiewicz and Alexander Pushkin. Mickiewicz denied Petersburg the right to be called a European city or even the creation of human hands civilizing the surrounding nature; he wrote that Petersburg was built by Satan.

Pushkin meanwhile explains his love for the city: "I love thee, Peter's creation!" The city is "Peter's creation," just like all new Russian culture, and just like Pushkin himself. For Pushkin, it has long been settled that Peter is *an expression of God's intentions for Russia*.

Let us listen closely: "*He is just like God's thunderstorm*."

The city has retained its sculptor's appearance, but people have forgotten about God's plan for Transfiguration, about the need to tame the elements, for which God gave man intelligence and strength—"He is just like God's thunderstorm" (*groza*) means not the elemental force, but the fact that Peter is formidable (*grozen*) like God, not like a man who has lost the light of reason and is therefore subject to the impersonal element of evil; that is, not like Ivan the Terrible (*groznyi*). The visage of God can only be reflected in an individual person, for it is the individual person who is created in His image and likeness, not the impersonal crowd, not the masses, not the elements.

Peter has transformed nature where it once seemed unthinkable, where a contemporary European would wash his hands of it all, forgetting that his own ancestors had overcome wildness, misfortunes, illnesses, and atrocities by people in power. Mickiewicz wrote of Peter that he "erected a bulwark for the empire,/a capital for himself, not a city for people." Pushkin followed Dante in considering the empire the supreme creation of state genius, for the empire was supra-confessional and created a legal framework. Wherever the law triumphs, the phenomenon of freedom is not far behind. The Roman Empire was more than just a government structure, it was a symbol of how a *non-barbarian* should live. It was the space necessary for the existence of civilized man, which is why the word "Rome" so caressed the ears of European poets, or as Mandelstam put it:

It is not Rome, the city, that lives among the ages,
But the place of man in the universe!

As a Slavic studies scholar and specialist on Russian literature Sergei Averintsev has noted:

> Tertullian, who hated the pagan Roman Empire, nonetheless believed that the end of Rome would be the end of the world and would clear space for a clash of otherworldly forces. How much more willingly they saw the existence of the Roman Empire as a barrier against the Antichrist and an eschatological 'omen' once that empire became Christian.[17]

Similarly, enlightened Russia perceived all pre-imperial Russian life as barbaric. It is clear, therefore, that this idea of the civilization of space inspired Peter the Great to build the Russian Empire, as I will show here. Nor should one forget the most important point, that it was Rome that spread the idea of Christ across Europe, and, as Dostoevsky says, Christianity demands of man *freedom and responsibility.*

It is not by chance that the great Russian émigré writer Georgy Fedotov called Pushkin "the singer of empire and freedom."

Mickiewicz, *who imagines himself the true European*, has forgotten the plague riots (Pushkin remembers: "A Feast During the Plague"), the Hundred Years' and Thirty Years' Wars, the humiliation of feudal tenants ("Scenes from the Days of Chivalry"), the slush and poverty that drove the English poor to suicide, and the horrors of the French Revolution (Pushkin remembers this, too: "We chose a murderer/And executioners as kings," in the poem "André Chénier," about the humane French revolutionaries who organized mass murder in the name of the people). Which of these was actually thinking about people? Pushkin is a realist, a man of clear and sober gaze. He does not idealize the Western Europe and he thus understands that *Russian wildness is not an insurmountable obstacle to Europeanization.*

Prominent Russian literary historian and critic Alfred Bem wrote about the miracle of Pushkin:

> Here we find the true miracle that defies any explanation. How did Pushkin manage to combine his "Europeanness," which had far outpaced Russian reality, with his "Russianness," that is, with a loyalty to the foundations of Russian culture and the Russian national spirit? One needed great faith in the creative genius of one's people and in the abilities of one's native culture to launch so high above existing reality without ending with a complete break from it. Only the striking sense of realism inherent to Pushkin allowed him the opportunity to carry himself to such heights without breaking away from his native soil … The miracle of Pushkin is precisely this, that he made a great leap into the

future without breaking away from his native soil, that he mana-
ged a brilliant combination of Russian tradition and the achieve-
ments of global culture. This miracle could not have happened
without the sense of equality that his exceptional mental talent and
hard work provided him.[18]

What is most important in this *history of Pushkin* is the fact that he is
a poet, the way that he became a poet, and the *kind* of poet he was, a poet of
national pride. Let us begin with the fact that the Slavophiles (from
I. Aksakov to V. Nepomnyashchiy) *designated* the poet's nursemaid as the
inspiration that shaped his muse, if not as his muse outright. This opinion has
become fixed even in school textbooks. This is what Ivan Aksakov writes:

> From his adolescence to the very grave, this brilliant and glorified
> poet, this zealous visitor to Hussar feasts and high-society salons,
> "our Byron," as many have preferred to call him, was not ashamed
> to confess his tender affection, both publicly and in wonderous
> poems, not for his mother (which would not be so strange, as
> many poets did just this) but for his "other" mother, his "nanny,"
> honoring her as with profound and sincere gratitude as his original
> muse … So this is the first inspiration, the first muse of this great
> artist who was the first true Russian poet, this nanny, this simple
> *old woman* from the Russian village.[19]

I would imagine, however, that the similar old village women who waited
on their young masters in pre-Petrine and even post-Petrine Rus', even the
kind of nurse we find in Fonvizin's *The Minor* who adores her "little child,"
did not invest in their souls even a millionth part of—well, not of Pushkin's
talent, per se, because no one except God would be capable of that, but at
least of Pushkin's depth, breadth, and all-embracing sensitivity; they did not
even teach them to speak and write fluently in Russian. They themselves
were illiterate. Aksakov falsely relates the poem "Confidante of magical
olden times … " (1822), about an elderly woman, or muse, who taught the
poet, to Arina Rodionovna, whom the poet truly loved but never called his
muse. These verses are addressed to his grandmother, Mariia Alekseevna
Gannibal, who, according to the biographer Pavel Annenkov,

> was a remarkable woman, both in terms of her life's adventures
> and in her common sense and experience. She was Pushkin's first
> mentor in the Russian language. Even at the Lyceum, Baron
> Delvig was thrilled by her writing style, by her strong and simple
> Russian speech.[20]

Now I would like to turn to the fate of Pushkin's great-grandfather, at least as Pushkin himself understood it, evaluating him as an expression of the same *spirit and principle* as the Transformer's reforms. Pushkin was well aware that Peter had taken this *alien and stranger* to his country, his France-educated African grandson, and *rooted* him in Russian boyar families, injecting him directly into the trunk of this Russian tree, just as he had done with European culture, European science, and the conduct of European life into Russia. The result of this inculcation was Russia's greatest poet: not a mystery, but a *key to Russia*.

Marina Tsvetaeva called this fellowship between the European-educated African residing in Paris and the great tsar "a conspiracy of equals," recalling Babeuf's conspiracy of socialists. Alas, not everyone came to understand this *Petrine conspiracy*, which was aimed at the spiritual elevation and transformation of the country. Speaking of the fate of Peter's heritage, we must not forget the most important thing that the Preobrazhenets left to the coming and future Russia: a new attitude toward Russia's position in the world *as a country capable of the self-creation of European culture*. In that sense, Pushkin is the direct heir to Peter's cause, completing in the spirit what Peter was crafting in the state. Here is Tsvetaeva, again:

> A conspiracy of equals.
> Without asking the midwives,
> The great-grandson of the Great's godson
> Was made heir to Peter's spirit,
>
> And his step, and a gaze the brightest
> Of the bright, which still shines …
> The final, posthumous, *im*mortal
> Gift to Russia, from Peter.
> —From "Peter and Pushkin," July 2, 1931

The Polish poet Mickiewicz wrote about the terrible flood of November 7, 1824. For him, this was the just reward to Russia and its tyrant for trying to become Europe. Mickiewicz's version has the Neva covered in ice in November, while Europe has only an autumn slush at its most extreme, but as Pushkin notes in *The Bronze Horseman*: "There was no snow: the Neva was not covered in ice." For Mickiewicz, Russia is a snow monster that will never be Europeanized, but Pushkin sees an entirely European slush in St. Petersburg, which, alas, does not stem the flood of the popular element. *Russia is a Europe and as such is still subject to the blows of elemental forces, just as the West used to be subject to them: this is his formulation of Russian history.*

As a result, to use a later observation by Vasily Kliuchevskii, "the new Russian Europe stood … before the old Roman-Germanic Europe."[21] For Pushkin, this is proof of divine power transforming nature through man. To repeat: Pushkin was a realist and did not idealize Western Europe, so Peter's cruelties did not fluster him. A key point of reference for him was Enlightenment, for which the West fought but did not always win, sometimes paying dearly, as in the terrible French Revolution. If the Son of God could be born to a despised tribe (as Pushkin wrote to Chaadaev), then anything is possible on this Earth. Rus' will return to Europe, because it is an original part of Europe,[22] both for better and for worse.

In emigration, Russian intellectuals who had fled or been expelled from Soviet Russia suddenly realized that Petersburgian Russia, more than any other, remained outside the borders of power. Russian post-revolutionary émigrés who saw Russia plunged into a "stream of new, destructive barbarism," which Struve called worse than primitive, sought out a name that could inspire Russia to a new civilizational breakthrough. This is what they found: "The era of Russian spiritual, social, and governmental Renaissance should be marked by Strength and Clarity, by Measure and Measuredness, by a Peter the Great enlightened by the artistic genius of Pushkin."[23]

The "Russian European" had to pass the Russia of the simple folk through its soul without breaking up, *without losing itself*. Only a "spiritual bogatyr" would be capable of such a feat. Well, Pushkin was that person. For this, he first needed a realism in his approach to life, not a critical or socialist realism, but a Christian and humanistic one; that is, an ability to see things as they are, to understand the complexity of the world, to avoid idealizing, constructing schemes, or saying what things should be, to find the possibility for a real transformation of reality on the basis of what is vital and available (in the deeds of a real person, Peter), and also to find a measure of private life: "There is no happiness on earth, but there is peace and freedom." No one is promised an earthly paradise. This is Pushkin's consistent position. There are, however, values developed by civilized humanity that must be defended: honor, dignity, independence, the right to freedom of labor, to one's "abode of labor and simple comforts," to creative freedom; in short, the right to sing to one's own tune. Both Peter and Pushkin wanted to give Russia a tune of its own.

Ivan Bunin wrote about Pushkin using He and Him; that is, with a capital letter, as others write about God. Ivan Shmelev formulated it thus: "Various peoples have revelatory writers. During years of defeat and

decline, a people often finds itself through them: they have the power of resurrection. Pushkin is our revelation, our mystery that we seem to have solved."[24] "Solved" in the sense that Pushkin himself is the key to Russia's fate, just as Christ is to the fate of humanity. Not by chance is his every step, his every word, his every note or slip of the tongue studied with such passionate love (like no other writer!). In sum, it might be said of him—of his singular self—that he is "the way and the truth" of Russia.

Notes

1. N.A. Berdyaev, "Rossiia i Velikorossiia," in N.A. Berdyaev, *Dukhovnye osnovy russkoi revoliutsii. Opyty 1917–1918 gg.* (St. Petersburg: RKhGI, 1999), p. 237.

2. V.A. Zhukovskii, *Estetika i kritika* (Moscow: Isskusstvo, 1983), p. 368.

3. ("To Delvig," 1821).

4. F. Stepun, "Dukhovnyi oblik Pushkina," in Fedor Stepun, *Vstrechi* (Moscow: Agraf, 1998), p. 11.

5. G. Adamovich, "Vernost Rossii," *Sovremennyi zapiski* (Paris, 1934), book 55, p. 332.

6. D.S. Merezhkovsky, "Pushkin," in D.S. Merezhkovsky, *Vechnye sputnik* (St. Petersburg, Moscow: Izdanie t-va M.O. Vol'f", 1911), pp. 338–39.

7. P.M. Bitsilli, "Poeziia Pushkina," in P.M. Bitsilli, *Izbrannye trudy po filologii* (Moscow: Nasledie, 1996), p. 450.

8. A.S. Pushkin, "O nichtozhestve literatury russkoi," in A.S. Pushkin, *Sobranie sochinenii v 10 tomakh* (Moscow: GIKhL, 1962), vol. 6, pp. 408–9.

9. That is, a soldier in the Preobrazhenskii regiment.—Trans.

10. (see E.R. Dashkova's *Notes*).

11. See G.M. Karpov, "Arkhitektor Peterburga Petr Mikhailovich Eropkin," *Voprosy istorii*, 2011, no. 2, pp. 131–43.

12. N.A. Berdyaev, "Konei Evropy," in N.A. Berdyaev, *Sud'by Rossii. Opyty po psikhologii voiny i natsional'nosti* (Moscow, 1918), p. 117.

13. *Petr Velikii v ego izrecheniiakh* (Moscow: Khudozhestvennaia literatura, 1991), p. 88.

14. D. Ium [Hume], "O vozniknovenii i razvitii iskusstv i nauk," in D. Ium, *Sochinenii v 2 t.* (Moscow: Mysl', 1966), p. 637.

15. M.S. Kiseleva, "Peterburg v kontekste khristianskoi sakral'nosti (Sviashchennye mogily sviashchennykh stolits)," in *Peterburg na filosofskoi karte mira* (St. Petersburg, 2004), vol. 3, p. 72.

16. G.P. Fedotov, "Tri stolitsy," in G. P. Fetodov, *Sud'ba i grekhi Rossii* (St. Petersburg: Sofiia), p. 51.

17. Fedotov, "Tri stolitsy," p. 124.

18. A. Bem, "Chudo Pushkina," in *"V kraiu chuzhom … " Zarubezhnaia Rossiia i Pushkina. Stat'i. Ocherki. Rechi* (Rybinskoe podvor'e, Russkii mir, 1998), p. 193.

19. I.S. Aksakov, "Rech' o A.S. Pushkine," in I.S. Aksakov, *I slovo pravdy …* (Ufa: Bashkirskoe knizhnoe izdatel'stvo, 1986), p. 208.

20. P.V. Annenkov, *Materialy dlia biografii A.S. Pushkina* (Moscow: Sovremennik, 1984), p. 41.

21. V.O. Kliuchevskii, *Sochineniia v 9-ti t.*, vol 4: Kurs russkoi istorii (Moscow, 1989), p. 206.

22. (Here it is worth recalling *Ruslan and Liudmilla*, "Song of the Wise Oleg," *Boris Godunov, The Bronze Horseman*, all of which read Russia's past as European).

23. P.B. Struve, "Imenem Pushkina," in *"V kraiu chuzhom ... "* pp. 61, 62.

24. I. Shmelev, "Pushkin. 1837–1937," in *"V kraiu chuzhom ... "* p. 177.